UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/584,712 | 06/26/2006 | Yoshikazu Kawagoe | 900-555 | 5078 |
| 23117 NIXON & VAN | 7590 02/27/200 NDERHYE, PC | EXAMINER | | |
| 901 NORTH G | LEBE ROAD, 11TH F | PATEL, DEVANG R | | |
| ARLINGTON, | VA 22203 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 1793 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/27/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/584,712 | KAWAGOE ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Ait Ollic | |

| | DEVANG PATEL | 1793 | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 20 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | R ALLOWANCE. | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | which places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | - | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (| ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | on. | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(| f). | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee be action; or (2) as | | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | " 'th 07 OFD 44 07 | 91-1-10k! ((k | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:, (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | ! | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). | | | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu The claims have not been amended and thus stand reje | | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other: | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | | | | |
| /Devang Patel/ | Wiless Observed | | | | | |
| Examiner, Art Unit 1793 | /Kiley Stoner/ Primary Examiner, Art U | nit 1793 | | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that connection of the structures is activated while entirely on the lower and upper belts 30 and 31 of Kannegiesser and such is in contrast with the positioning belt as recited. Examiner disagrees. The "connection of structures" in Kannegiesser refers to articles being worked upon by the belt apparatus and activation of workpieces is immaterial to the positioning belt arrangement.

Applicant argues that upper belt 31 overlaps only the lower belt 30 (positioning belt), it does not overlap any other belt. In response, Examiner contends that the claim as currently recited only requires that "press belt overlaps at least a portion of the positioning belt", not any other belt.

Applicant argues that both Kannegiesser and Gabini are not analogous to JP '188 because both are directed to laminating flexible structures while JP '188 is directed toward soldering solar cells and lead tabs, which are rigid. In response, Examiner contends that all three references are analogous art since they all concern bonding using belt conveyance mechanism.

Applicant also argues that conveyor 10 and conveyance mechanism are one and the same. However, JP '188 states" photovoltaic cell... was carried by the conveyance mechanism equipped with the adsoprtion pad etc., which is not illustrated on a conveyor 10 on the supply stage 11" [¶ 19]. JP '188 agains states: "photovoltaic cell... was carried by the conveyance mechanism which is not illustrated is carried on a conveyor 10 on the supply stage [¶ 29]. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that JP '188 distinguises between a conveyor and a conveyance mechanism.

With respect to claim 5, Applicant argues that proposed modification by Focke would render JP '188 unsatisfactory for its inteneded purpose. However, the instant rejection relies on combined teachings of JP '188, Garbini and Focke. JP '188 in view of Garbini discloses heating belt and press belt arrangement similar to that of Fig. 1 of Garbini, which is comparable to belt arrangement of fig. 1 of Focke. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to includes leaf springs of Focke in the modified apparaus of JP '188 in order to effectively press the belts together and thus, provide sufficient heating for bonding.